

AS

17. (Amended) The saw recited in claim 16, said lug [and recess having a shape which allows said lug to be] being blocked against being received in said recess in at least one position of rotation of said pin, said second wall not extending adjacent said first wall at the location of said pin.

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 19 remain pending in the present application. Claims 2, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15 and 17 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the drawings, specification and claims as originally filed.

Applicant has amended the specification and drawings in an attempt to overcome the Examiner's objections. Applicant now believes these objections to be overcome and respectfully requests withdrawal of the same.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected several of the claims under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, alleging them to be indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended Claims 2, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15 and 17 in an attempt to overcome the Examiner's Section 112 rejection. In light of these amendments, Applicant believes the claims to overcome the Examiner's Section 112, second paragraph rejection and respectfully requests withdrawal of the same.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Hagen et al. The Examiner alleges that Hagen et al discloses Applicant's invention.

Claim 1, among other elements, defines a retaining member on which a blade for clamping may be mounted. The retaining member is lockable in at least two positions. Each of the at least two positions clamp the blade at a predetermined angle relative to the shaft.

The Hagen et al reference cited by the Examiner fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's invention. Hagen et al discloses a mounting system which includes a cylindrical blade holder 12 which is divided into two halves by a slot 14. The blade 19, positioned into the slot, includes two tongues 20 and 21 which project from the blade. As the blade is positioned into the slot 14, the tongues 20 and 21 are compressed and then expand in the slot 14 to axially fix the blade in the holder 12. The blade 19 is positioned in the holder 12 in only one position. The Hagen et al reference fails to disclose or suggest a retaining member lockable in at least two positions. Further, it fails to disclose or suggest that each of the at least two positions clamps the blade at a predetermined angle relative to the shaft. Applicant would like to draw the Examiner's attention to Applicant's Figures 5, 8 and 9 where the blade is shown in various positions. Hagen fails to disclose or suggest such features. Accordingly, Applicant believes Claims 1 and 2 through 14 which depend from Claim 1 to be patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.

Claim 15 is an independent claim. Claim 15, among other elements, defines a pin disposed through a first wall at a location of the recess that includes a lug formed on one end. The lug has a shape corresponding to the recess. The pin is biased with

the lug received in the recess such that the pin is movable against the bias to move the lug out of the recess. The pin is secured against rotation while the lug is received in the recess. The pin is rotatable when the lug is moved out of the recess.

The Hagen reference cited by the Examiner fails to disclose or suggest Claim



15. As mentioned above, Hagen includes tongues 20 and 21 which secure the blade in its only position in the holder 12. Hagen discloses a contacting element 26 which element is non-rotatable. Thus, Hagen fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's invention. Accordingly, Applicant believes Claim 15 as well as Claims 16 through 19 which depend from Claim 15 to be patentably distinguishable over the art cited by the Examiner.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant would submit that the application is now in proper order and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present Amendment, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned attorney or Bruce Shapiro at (410) 716-3254.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

W. R. Duke Taylor
Reg. No. 31306
Attorneys for Applicant

Dated: November 21, 2000 BY:

P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303
(248) 641-1600

Attorney Docket No. CS1061#SP
(HD&P Reference No. 0275S-500763)

WRDT/kmg

RECEIVED
DEC - 1 2000

C 3700 MAIL ROOM